

## REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-15 and 17-20 will remain pending in this application. Claims 1-9, 11, 13-15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,504 (“Toga”). Claims 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Toga. Applicants respectfully traverse.

### *Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 1-9, 11 and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Toga. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The claimed invention is directed to shared views of content. More specifically, the claimed invention provides techniques that enable the same content to be *concurrently* sent to *multiple* locations (e.g., a host client and one or more slave clients) in response to a *single* request. This may be useful, for example, if ten people in ten different locations are having a discussion about content on a web page, and all ten people wish to concurrently view the web page at the same time. In this scenario, only one of the ten people (e.g., the person operating the host client) may request the web page, rather than all ten people issuing ten separate requests.

Toga is directed to techniques for delivering data. Toga discloses that a user at a first location can send a request for content to be delivered to the first location **OR** a second alternate location that is different from the first location. The alternate location may be a different computer or an email address. As noted in Toga “the file is sent by server 50 . . . to that client 40 or a second client at a second time.” (Toga, Col. 2, ll. 54-58) (emphasis added). Toga also mentions that content may be delivered from a third party requestor to another recipient. (Toga, Col. 5, ll. 33-42).

Thus, Toga does not teach or suggest “for causing the server, in response to the single request, to concurrently deliver via the communications interface to the host client computer and to each slave client computer the content corresponding to the locator,” as recited in claim 1 and similar language from other independent claims 13, 15, 17 and 20.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 13, 15, 17 and 20 are not anticipated by Toga. Applicants further submit that claims 2-9, 11, 14 and 18-

**DOCKET NO.:** 126608.03 / MSFT-1210  
**Application No.:** 10/068,816  
**Office Action Dated:** October 17, 2006

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

20 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections are respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Toga. Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that claims 10 and 12 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** 126608.03 / MSFT-1210  
**Application No.:** 10/068,816  
**Office Action Dated:** October 17, 2006

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that no new matter has been added by the present amendment. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: December 18, 2006

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
2929 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439